

Interchanging distance and capacity in probabilistic mappings

Reid Andersen* Uriel Feige†

July 21, 2009

Abstract

Harald Räcke [STOC 2008] described a new method to obtain hierarchical decompositions of networks in a way that minimizes the congestion. Räcke’s approach is based on an equivalence that he discovered between minimizing congestion and minimizing stretch (in a certain setting). Here we present Räcke’s equivalence in an abstract setting that is more general than the one described in Räcke’s work, and clarifies the power of Räcke’s result. In addition, we present a related (but different) equivalence that was developed by Yuval Emek [ESA 2009] and is only known to apply to planar graphs.

1 Introduction

In this manuscript we present results of a manuscript of Harald Räcke titled “Optimal hierarchical decompositions for congestion minimization in networks” [16]. Our presentation is more modular than the original presentation of Räcke in that it separates the existential aspects of Räcke’s result from the algorithmic aspects. The existential results are presented in a more abstract setting that allows the reader to appreciate the generality of Räcke’s result. Our presentation is also more careful not to lose on the tightness of the parameters (e.g., not to give away constant multiplicative factors). For slides of a talk based on this manuscript see [10].

Our manuscript is organized as follows. In Section 2 we discuss the optimization problem of min-bisection. Achieving an improved approximation ratio for this problem is one of the results of [16], and we use this problem as a motivation for the main results that follows. In Section 3 we present in an abstract setting what we view as Räcke’s main result, namely, an equivalence between two types of probabilistic embeddings, one concerned with faithfully representing distances and the other with faithfully representing capacities. In Section 4

*Microsoft Live Labs, One Microsoft Way, Redmond, WA 98052. reidan@microsoft.com.

†Department of Computer Science and Applied Mathematics, Weizmann Institute, Rehovot 76100, Israel. uriel.feige@weizmann.ac.il. Supported in part by The Israel Science Foundation (grant No. 873/08).

we briefly discuss algorithmic versions of the existential result. In Section 5 we show how the machinery developed leads to an approximation algorithm for min-bisection. In Section 6 we present results related to the main theme of this manuscript, but that do not appear in [16]. These results concern an equivalence between deterministic embeddings in planar graphs, and were first developed and used by Yuval Emek in [8].

2 Min-bisection

In the min-bisection problem, the input is a graph with an even number n of vertices. In the weighted version of the problem, edges have arbitrary nonnegative weights, whereas in the unweighted version, the weight of every edge is 1. A bisection of the graph is a partition the set of vertices into two sets of equal size. The width of a bisection is the total weight of the edges that are cut (an edge is cut if its endpoints are on different sides of the partition). Min-bisection asks for a bisection of minimum width. This problem is NP-hard.

One line of research dealing with the NP-hardness of min-bisection offers a bi-criteria approximation. Namely, it is concerned with developing algorithms that produce a partition of the graph into nearly equal parts (rather than exactly equal parts), such that the width of the partition is not much larger than the width of the minimum bisection. The methodology used by these algorithms was developed in a sequence of papers and currently allows one to efficiently find a near bisection (e.g., each of the two parts has at least one third of the vertices) whose width is within a multiplicative factor of $O(\sqrt{\log n})$ of the width of the minimum bisection. The methodology used by these papers is related to the theme of the current manuscript. It also uses an interplay between distance and capacity. We briefly explain this interplay, and refer the readers to [14, 15, 4] for more details.

For simplicity, assume that the input graph is a complete graph, by replacing non-edges by edges of weight 0. View the weight of an edge in a min-bisection problem as specifying its capacity. The width of a bisection is the total capacity of its associated cut. The first phase of the bicriteria approximation algorithm involves solving some linear program LP (in [14, 15]) or semidefinite program SDP (in [4]). The output of this mathematical program can be thought of as a fractional cut in the following sense: edges are assigned lengths, and the longer an edge is, a larger fraction of it belongs to the cut. Naturally, for the fractional solution to have small value, the LP (or SDP) will try to assign short lengths to edges of high capacity. (This is a theme that will reappear in the proof of Theorem 6.) Thereafter, this fractional solution is rounded to give a near bisection of width not much larger than the value of the fractional solution. The rounding procedure is more likely to cut the long edges than the short edges. Or equivalently, two vertices of short distance from each other (where distance is measured by sum of edge lengths along shortest path) are likely to fall in the same side of the partition. Hence to find a near bisection of small capacity, the bicriteria approximation algorithms introduce an intermediate notion of

distance, and carefully choose (as a solution to the LP or SDP) a distance function that interacts well with the capacities of the edges. In fact, there is a formal connection between the distortion of this distance function in comparison to ℓ_1 distances and the approximation ratio (in terms of minimizing capacity) that one gets from this methodology. (See [15] for an exact statement.)

To move from a bicriteria approximation to a true approximation (in which the output is a true bisection, and approximation is only in the sense that the width is not necessarily optimal), it appears unavoidable that one should use in some way dynamic programming. Consider the task of determining whether a graph has a bisection of width 0. Such a bisection exists if and only if there is a set of connected components of the graph whose total size is exactly $n/2$. Determining whether this is the case amounts to solving a subset sum problem (with sizes of connected components serving as input to the subset sum problem), and the only algorithm known to solve subset sum (in time polynomial in the numbers involved) is dynamic programming. In [11], the techniques used in the bicriteria approximation were combined with a dynamic programming approach to produce a true approximation for min-bisection with approximation ratio $O((\log n)^{3/2})$ (obtained as the bicriteria approximation ratio times $O(\log n)$). Here we shall describe Räcke’s approach that gives a better approximation ratio, $O(\log n)$.

Trees (and more generally, graphs of bounded treewidth, though this subject is beyond the scope of the current manuscript) form a family of graphs on which many NP-hard problems can be solved using dynamic programming. In particular, min bisection can be solved in polynomial time on trees. This suggests the following plan for approximating min-bisection on general graphs, which is presented here using terms that are suggestive but have not been defined yet. First, find a “low distortion embedding” of the input graph into a tree. Then solve min bisection optimally on the tree, using dynamic programming. The solution will induce a bisection on the original graph, and the approximation ratio will be bounded by the distortion of the embedding into the tree.

The plan as described above has certain drawbacks. One is that the distortion when embedding a general graph into a tree might be very large (e.g., the distance distortion for an n -cycle). This problem has been addressed in a satisfactory way in previous work [2, 5]. Rather than embed the graph in one tree, one finds a probabilistic embedding into a family of (dominating) trees (the requirement that the trees be dominating is a technical requirement that will be touched upon in Section 5), and considers average distortion (averaged over all trees). When the objective function is linear (as in the case of min bisection), the probabilistic notion of embedding suffices. Hence the modified plan is as follows. Find a low distortion probability distribution over embeddings of the input graph into (dominating) trees. Then solve min bisection optimally on each of these trees. Each of these solutions will induce a bisection on the original graph, and for the best of them the approximation ratio will be bounded by the *average* distortion of the probabilistic embedding into trees.

The known probabilistic embeddings of graphs into trees are tailored to minimize average distortion, where the aspect that is being distorted is distance

between vertices. However, for the intended application of min bisection, the aspect that interests us is the capacity of cuts rather than distances. Hence Räcke’s approach for approximating min-bisection is as described above, but with the distinction that the distortion of embeddings is measured with respect to capacity rather than distance.

To implement this approach, one needs to design probabilistic embeddings with low capacity distortion. Here is an informal statement of Räcke’s result in this respect.

Theorem 1 *For every graph on n vertices there is a probability distribution of embeddings into (dominating) trees with $O(\log n)$ average distortion of the capacity. Moreover, these embeddings can be found in polynomial time.*

This theorem is analogous to known theorems regarding the distortion of distances in probabilistic embeddings [9]. Räcke’s proof of Theorem 1 is by a reduction between these two types of embeddings. The existence of such a reduction may not be unexpected (as an afterthought), because as we have seen in the bicriteria approximation algorithms, there are certain correspondences between capacity and distance.

As a direct consequence of the theorem above and the modified plan for approximating min bisection, one obtains an $O(\log n)$ approximation for min bisection. This will be discussed in more detail in Section 5.

3 An abstract setting

In this section we present an abstract setting that as a special case will lead to the existential component of Theorem 1.

3.1 Definitions

Let E be a set (of edges) and $\mathcal{P}$ a collection of nonempty multisets of E (that we call paths). A mapping $M : E \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ maps to every edge $i \in E$ a path $P \in \mathcal{P}$. It will be convenient to represent a mapping by a matrix M , where M_{ij} counts the number of times the edge j lies on the path $M(i)$.

Spanning tree example. E is a set of edges of a connected graph G . Consider a spanning tree T of G , and let $\mathcal{P}$ be the set of simple paths in T . Then there is a natural mapping M that maps every edge $(i, j) \in E$ to the set of edges that form the unique simple path between vertices i and j in T .

Tree embedding example. E is a set of edges of a connected graph G . Consider an arbitrary tree T defined over the same set of vertices as G (edges of T need not be edges of G). As in the spanning tree example above, there is a natural mapping from edges of G to paths in T . However, this is not a mapping in the sense defined above, because edges of T are not necessarily edges of G . To remedy this situation, we represent each edge (i, j) of T by a set of edges that form a simple path between i and j in G . This representation is not unique (there may be many simple paths between i and j in G), and hence

some convention is used to specify one such path uniquely (for example, one may take a shortest path, breaking ties arbitrarily). Hence now each edge of T corresponds to a set of edges in G , and each simple path in T corresponds to a collection of several such sets. Now T can be the mapping that maps each edge (i, j) in G to a multiset of edges of G that is obtained by joining together (counting multiplicities) the sets of edges of G that form the paths that correspond to the edges of T that lie along the simple path connecting i and j in T .

Graph embedding example. This is a generalization of the tree embedding example. E is a set of edges of a connected graph G on n , and H is an arbitrary different graph defined on the same set of vertices. Now an edge $(i, j) \in E$ is mapped to some path (using a convention such as that of taking a shortest path) that connects i and j in H , and this path in H is represented as a multiset of edges in G (as in the tree embedding example). This defines a mapping M . Natural alternative versions of the mapping reduce the multiset to a set, either by removing multiplicities of edges in the multiset, or by more extensive processing (e.g., if the multiset corresponded to a nonsimple path in G that contains cycles, these cycles may possibly be removed).

Hypergraph example. E is the set of hyperedges of a connected 3-uniform hypergraph H . T is a spanning tree of the hypergraph H , in the sense that it is defined on the same set of vertices as H , and every edge (i, j) of T is labeled by some hyperedge of H that contains vertices i and j . Then a hyperedge i, j, k can be mapped to the set of hyperedges that label the set of edges along the paths that connect i, j and k in T .

We note that the tree embedding example is essentially the setting in Räcke's work [16]. However the spanning tree example suffices in order to illustrate the main ideas in Räcke's work.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a family of *admissible* mappings. A probabilistic mapping between E and $\mathcal{M}$ is a probability distribution over mappings $M \in \mathcal{M}$. That is, with every $M \in \mathcal{M}$ we associate some $\lambda_M \geq 0$, with $\sum_M \lambda_M = 1$.

We shall consider probabilistic mappings in two different contexts.

Definition 2 (Distance mapping). *Every edge i has a positive length ℓ_i associated with it. We let $\text{dist}_M(i)$ denote the length of the path $M(i)$, namely $\text{dist}_M(i) = \sum_j M_{ij} \ell_j$. The stretch of an edge i is $\frac{\text{dist}_M(i)}{\ell_i}$. The average stretch of an edge in a probabilistic mapping is the weighted average (weighted according to λ_M) of the stretches of the edge. The stretch of a probabilistic mapping is the maximum over all edges of their average stretches.*

The stretch of a particular edge may be smaller than 1. However, the stretch of the shortest edge will always be at least 1.

Probabilistic distance mappings were considered in [2, 7, 1] for the spanning tree example, and in [5, 9] for the tree embedding example.

Definition 3 (Capacity mapping). *Every edge i has a positive capacity c_i associated with it. We let $\text{load}_M(j)$ denote the sum (with multiplicities) of capacities of edges whose path under M contains j . Namely, $\text{load}_M(j) = \sum_i M_{ij} c_i$.*

The congestion of an edge j is $\frac{\text{load}_M(j)}{c_j}$. The average congestion of an edge in a probabilistic mapping is the weighted average (weighted according to λ_M) of the congestions of the edge. The congestion of a probabilistic mapping is the maximum over all edges of their average congestions.

The congestion of an edge may be smaller than 1. However, the sum of all capacities in $M(E)$ is at least as large as the sum of all capacities in E , implying that the congestion of a probabilistic mapping is always at least 1.

For concreteness, let us present the notions of distance, stretch, load and congestion as applied to the spanning tree example. Consider a connected graph G in which every edge $e = (i, j)$ has a positive length ℓ_e and a positive capacity c_e . Consider an arbitrary spanning tree T of G , and the mapping from G to T described in the spanning tree example above. Then the distance of edge e is the sum of length of edges along the unique simple path that connects vertices i and j in T . The stretch of e is then the ratio between this distance and ℓ_e . The load on edge e is 0 if e is not part of the spanning tree. However, if e is part of the spanning tree, the load is computed as follows. Removing e , the tree T decomposes into two trees, one containing vertex i (that we call T_i) and the other containing vertex j (that we call T_j). The load of e is the sum of capacities of all edges (including e itself) that have one endpoint in T_i and the other in T_j . The congestion of e is the ratio between the load and c_e .

3.2 Probabilistic mappings as zero-sum games

We shall use the following standard consequence of the minimax theorem for zero sum games (as in [2]).

Lemma 4 *For every $\rho \geq 1$ and every family of admissible mappings $\mathcal{M}$, there is a probabilistic mapping with stretch at most ρ if and only if for every nonnegative coefficients α_i , there is a mapping $M \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\sum \alpha_i \frac{\text{dist}_M(i)}{\ell_i} \leq \rho \sum \alpha_i$.*

Proof. Consider a zero sum game in which the player MAP chooses an admissible mapping M , and the player EDGE chooses an edge i . The value of the game for for EDGE is the stretch of i in the mapping, and hence EDGE wishes to maximize the stretch whereas MAP wishes to minimize it. A probabilistic mapping is a randomized strategy for MAP. Choosing nonnegative coefficients α_i (and scaling them so that $\sum \alpha_i = 1$) is a randomized strategy for EDGE.

The “only if” direction. If there is no randomized strategy for MAP forcing an expected value at most ρ , then the minimax theorem implies that there must be a randomized strategy for EDGE that enforces an expected value more than ρ , regardless of which mapping player MAP chooses to play.

The “if” direction. If there is no randomized strategy for EDGE forcing an expected value larger than ρ , then the minimax theorem implies that there must be a randomized strategy for MAP that enforces an expected value of at most ρ , regardless of which edge player EDGE chooses to play. ■

Lemma 5 *For every $\rho \geq 1$ and every family of admissible mappings $\mathcal{M}$, there is a probabilistic mapping with congestion at most ρ if and only if for every nonnegative coefficients β_i , there is a mapping $M \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\sum \beta_i \frac{\text{load}_M(i)}{c_i} \leq \rho \sum \beta_i$.*

The proof of Lemma 5 is similar to the proof of Lemma 4, and hence is omitted.

3.3 Main result

Theorem 6 *For every $\rho \geq 1$ and every family of admissible mappings $\mathcal{M}$, the following two statements are equivalent:*

1. *For every collection of lengths ℓ_i there is a probabilistic mapping with stretch at most ρ .*
2. *For every collection of capacities c_j there is a probabilistic mapping with congestion at most ρ .*

Proof. We first prove that item 2 implies item 1.

Assume that there is a probabilistic mapping from E using $\mathcal{M}$ with congestion at most ρ . By Lemma 5, for every nonnegative coefficients β_j , there is a mapping $M \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\sum \beta_j \frac{\text{load}_M(j)}{c_j} \leq \rho \sum \beta_j$. Hence, using the notation from Definition 3, for every nonnegative coefficients β_j we have a mapping satisfying:

$$\sum_{j,i \in E} \beta_j M_{ij} \frac{c_i}{c_j} \leq \rho \sum_{j \in E} \beta_j \quad (1)$$

We need to prove that there is a probabilistic mapping from E using $\mathcal{M}$ with stretch at most ρ . By Lemma 4, it suffices to prove that for every nonnegative coefficients α_i , there is a mapping $M \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\sum \alpha_i \frac{\text{dist}_M(i)}{\ell_i} \leq \rho \sum \alpha_i$. Hence, using the notation from Definition 2, for every nonnegative coefficients α_i we need to find a mapping satisfying:

$$\sum_{i,j \in E} \alpha_i M_{ij} \frac{\ell_j}{\ell_i} \leq \rho \sum_{i \in E} \alpha_i \quad (2)$$

Choosing $\beta_j = \alpha_j$ and $c_i = \alpha_i / \ell_i$ (and likewise, $c_j = \alpha_j / \ell_j$) and substituting in inequality (1), we obtain inequality (2).

The proof that item 1 implies item 2 is similar, choosing $\alpha_i = \beta_i$ and $\ell_i = \beta_i / c_i$, and then inequality (2) becomes inequality (1). $\blacksquare$

Observe that the proof of Theorem 6 does not assume that entries of matrices $M \in \mathcal{M}$ are nonnegative integers (except for the issue that ρ is stated as a quantity of value at least 1). Neither does it assume that distances or capacities are nonnegative (though they cannot be 0, since the expressions for stretch and congestion involve divisions by distances or capacities).

3.4 Simultaneous stretch and congestion bounds

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a family of admissible mappings for which there is a probabilistic mapping with stretch at most ρ . Hence by Theorem 6, there is also a (possibly different) probabilistic mapping with congestion at most ρ . However, this does not imply that there is a probabilistic mapping which simultaneously achieves stretch at most ρ and congestion at most ρ .

Consider the following example. The edges E are the set of edges of the following graph G . G has two special vertices denoted by s and t . There are $\sqrt{n}$ vertex disjoint paths between s and t , each with $\sqrt{n}$ edges. In addition, there is the edge (s, t) . Hence altogether E contains $n + 1$ edges. The family $\mathcal{M}$ of admissible mappings is the canonical family corresponding to the set of all spanning trees of G , as described in Section 3.1; given an edge of E and a spanning tree T of G , the edge is mapped to the unique path in T joining its endpoints.

Let ℓ be an arbitrary length function on E . The following is a probabilistic mapping into $\mathcal{M}$ of stretch at most 3. Let P be the shortest path in G between s and t (breaking ties arbitrarily). It may be either the edge (s, t) or one of the $\sqrt{n}$ paths. For the probabilistic mapping, we choose a random spanning tree as follows. All edges of P are contained in the spanning tree. In addition, from every path $P' \neq P$, exactly one edge is deleted, with probability proportional to the length of the edge.

Let us analyze the expected stretch of the above probabilistic mapping. For edges along the path P , the stretch is 1. Consider now an edge of length ℓ in a path $P' \neq P$ of length L . With probability $(L - \ell)/L < 1$ the edge remains in the random spanning tree, keeping its original length. With probability ℓ/L the edge is not in the spanning tree, and then it is mapped to a path of length at most $2L - \ell < 2L$ (we used here the fact that the length of P is at most L). Hence the expected stretch is smaller than $1 + 2L \frac{\ell}{L} \leq 3$.

Let c be an arbitrary capacity function on E . The following is a probabilistic mapping into $\mathcal{M}$ of congestion at most 3. For every path P_j between s and t (including the edge (s, t) as one of the paths), let e_j denote the edge of minimum capacity on this path, and let c_j be its capacity. Choose a random spanning tree that contains all edges except the e_j edges, and exactly one of the e_j edges, chosen with probability proportional to its capacity.

Let us analyze the expected congestion of the above probabilistic mapping. Consider an arbitrary edge e on path P_j . Its capacity c is at least c_j . The load that it suffers is at most its own capacity c , plus perhaps the capacity $c_j \leq c$ of edge e_j , plus with probability $c_j/(\sum_i c_i) \leq c/(\sum_i c_i)$ a capacity of $\sum_{i \neq j} c_i \leq \sum_i c_i$, which in expectation contributes at most c . Hence altogether, its expected load is at most $3c$.

The two probabilistic mappings that we designed (one for stretch, one for congestion) are very different. In particular, the sizes of the supports are $n\sqrt{n}$ for the stretch case and $\sqrt{n} + 1$ for the congestion case. We now show that if in the graph G all lengths and all capacities are equal to 1 (the unweighted case), every probabilistic mapping must have either stretch or congestion at least

$\sqrt{n}/2$. To achieve stretch less than $\sqrt{n}/2$, the edge (s, t) must belong to the random spanning tree with probability at least $1/2$. However, whenever (s, t) is in the spanning tree, then from every other path connecting s and t one edge needs to be removed, contributing a total load of $\sqrt{n}$ to the edge (s, t) . It is also interesting to observe that a random spanning tree (chosen uniformly at random from all spanning trees) contains the edge (s, t) with probability exactly $1/2$ (this is because the effective resistance between s and t is $1/2$, details omitted). Hence the uniform distribution over spanning trees is simultaneously bad (distortion at least $\sqrt{n}/2$) both for stretch and for congestion.

We have seen that the probabilistic mappings that achieve low congestion may be very different than those that achieve low stretch. However, as we shall see in Section 6, for the special case considered here (that of spanning trees in planar graphs), there are additional connections between stretch and congestion, based on planar duality.

4 Algorithmic aspects

In Section 3 our discussion was concerned only with the existence of probabilistic mappings. Here we shall discuss how such mappings can be found efficiently. As we have seen in Section 3.2, and using the notation of Lemma 4, the problem of finding a probabilistic mapping with smallest distortion can be cast as a problem of finding an optimal mixed strategy for the player MAP, in a zero sum game between the players MAP and EDGE. We shall briefly review the known results concerning the computation of optimal mixed strategies in zero sum games, and how they can be applied in our setting. Hence in a sense, this section is independent of Section 3.

4.1 An LP formulation of zero sum games

It is well known that the value of a zero sum game is a solution to a linear program (LP), and that linear programming duality in this case implies the minimax theorem.

Consider a game matrix A with r rows (the pure strategies for MAP) and c columns (the pure strategies for EDGE), in which entry A_{ij} contains the payoff for EDGE if MAP plays row i and EDGE plays column j . Map wishes to select a mixed strategy that minimizes the expected payoff, whereas EDGE wishes to select a mixed strategy that maximizes this payoff.

With each row i we can associate a variable x_i that denotes the probability with which row i is played in MAP's mixed strategy. Then the linear program is to *minimize* ρ subject to:

- $\sum_i A_{ij} x_i \leq \rho$ for all columns j ,
- $\sum x_i = 1$,
- $x_i \geq 0$ for all i .

An immediate consequence of this LP formulation is that an optimal solution to the LP can be found in time polynomial in the size of the game matrix A (e.g., using the Ellipsoid algorithm). However, in our context of probabilistic mappings, it will often be the case that the size of A is not polynomial in the parameters of interest. For example, when mapping a graph G into a distribution over spanning trees, the parameter of interest is typically n , the number of vertices in the graph. The number of edges (and hence number of columns in A) is at most n^2 and hence polynomially bounded in n . However, the number of mappings (number of spanning trees in G) might be of the order of $n^{\Omega(n)}$, which is not polynomial in n . Hence if one is interested in algorithms with running time polynomial in n , one cannot even write down the matrix A explicitly (though the graph G serves as an implicit representation of A).

Though the case that will interest us most is when there are superpolynomially many row strategies and polynomially many column strategies, let us discuss first the case when there are polynomially many row strategies and superpolynomially many column strategies.

We note that in the discussions that follow we shall assume that all payoffs are rational numbers with numerators and denominators represented by a number of bits that is polynomial in a parameter of interest (such as the smallest of the two dimensions of A).

4.2 Superpolynomially many column strategies

As we cannot afford to write the matrix A explicitly, we need to assume some other mechanism for accessing the strategies of the column player. Typically, this is viewed abstractly as *oracle* access. A natural oracle model is the following:

Best response oracle. Given a mixed strategy for the row player, the oracle provides a pure strategy for the column player of highest expected payoff (together with the corresponding column of A).

If a best response oracle is available, one may still run the ellipsoid algorithm (with the best response oracle serving as a separation oracle) and obtain an optimal solution to the LP (and hence an optimal mixed strategy for the game). See [13] for more details on this approach.

4.3 Superpolynomially many row strategies

Here we address the main case of interest, when there are superpolynomially many row strategies, but only polynomially many column strategies. One issue that has to be dealt with is whether an optimal mixed strategy for the row player can be represented at all in polynomial space, given that potentially it requires specifying probabilities for superpolynomially many strategies. Luckily, the answer is positive. Mixed strategies are solutions to linear programs, and linear programs have *basic feasible solutions* in which the number of nonzero variables does not exceed the number of constraints (omitting the nonnegativity constraints $x_i \geq 0$). Hence there is an optimal mixed strategy for the row player

whose support (the number of pure strategies that have positive probability of being played) is not larger than the number of columns.

To access the pure strategies of the row player, let us assume here that we have a best response oracle for the row player. Now a standard approach is to consider the dual of the LP, which corresponds to finding an optimal mixed strategy for the column player. By analogy to Section 4.2, one can use the ellipsoid algorithm to find an optimal mixed strategy for the column player.

An optimal solution to the dual LP has the same value as an optimal solution to the primal LP, but is not by itself a solution to the primal LP (and hence, we still did not find an optimal mixed strategy for the row player). However, there are certain ways of leveraging the ability to solve the dual LP and using it so as to also solve the primal LP. One such approach employs an exploration phase that finds polynomially many linearly independent constraints of the dual that are tight at the optimal dual solution, and then find an optimal primal solution that is supported only on the primal variables that correspond to these dual constraints. Details are omitted here (but presumably appear in [13]).

4.4 Weaker oracle models and faster algorithms

In the games that interest us, typically there are polynomially many columns (the column player is EDGE who can play an edge in the graph) and superpolynomially many rows (the row player Map has exponentially many mappings to choose from). In this respect, we are in the setting of Section 4.3. However, we might not have a best response oracle representation of MAP. Instead we shall often have a weaker kind of oracle.

δ -response oracle. Given a mixed strategy for the column player, the oracle provides a pure strategy for the row player (together with the corresponding row of A) that limits the expected payoff (to column player) to at most δ .

Let ρ be the true minimax value of the game. Then the value of δ for a δ -response oracle must be at least ρ , but in general might be much larger than ρ . If this is the only form of access to the pure strategies of the row player, finding an optimal mixed strategy for the row player becomes hopeless. Hence the goal is no longer to find the optimal mixed strategy for the row player, but rather to find a mixed strategy that limits the expected payoff of the column player to at most δ (plus low order terms). We sketch here an approach of Freund and Schapire [12] that can be used. It is based on the use of *regret minimizing* algorithms.

Consider an iterative process in which in each round, the column player selects a mixed strategy, the row player selects in response a δ -response (pure) strategy, and the column player collects the expected payoff of his mixed strategy against that pure strategy. If the column player is using a regret minimizing online algorithm in order to select his mixed strategies (such as using a multiplicative weight update rule), then after polynomially many rounds (say, t), his payoff (which can be at most δt) is guaranteed to approach (up to low order terms) the total payoff that the best fixed column pure strategy can achieve against the actual sequence of pure strategies played by the row player. This

means that if the row player plays the mixed strategy of choosing one of the t rounds at random and playing the row strategy that was played in this round, no pure column strategy has expected payoff significantly larger than δ . For more details on this subject, the reader is referred to [12], or to surveys such as [6] or [3].

4.5 Implementation for probabilistic mappings

Consider a zero sum game as in the setting of Lemma 2. EDGE has polynomially many strategies, whereas MAP potentially has exponentially many strategies. A best response oracle for MAP needs to be able to find a best response for MAP against any given mixed strategy of EDGE. In many contexts, finding the best response is NP-hard. However, for the intended applications, often a δ -response suffices, provided that one can guarantee that δ is not too large. Indeed, given coefficients α_i of the edges of the input graph, one can find a spanning tree with average stretch $\tilde{O}(\log n)$ [1] (the $\tilde{O}$ notation hides some lower order multiplicative terms), and a tree embedding of average stretch $O(\log n)$ [9]. This in combination with an algorithmic framework similar to that outlined in Section 4.4 gives probabilistic embeddings with stretch $\tilde{O}(\log n)$ and $O(\log n)$ respectively.

The above results in combination with Theorem 6 imply that there is also a probabilistic mapping into spanning trees with congestion $\tilde{O}(\log n)$ and a probabilistic mapping into (arbitrary) trees with congestion $O(\log n)$. To actually find such a mapping algorithmically, one needs to find a mixed strategy for the player MAP in the corresponding zero sum game. The algorithmic framework of Section 4.4 shows that this can be done if we can implement a δ -response oracle for MAP. We have already seen that such an oracle can be implemented for distance mapping, but now need to do so for capacity mappings. Luckily, the proof of Theorem 6 can be used for this purpose. It shows how to transform any δ -response query to a capacity mapping oracle into a δ -response query to a distance mapping oracle. This establishes the algorithmic aspect of Theorem 1. We remark that the resulting probabilistic mappings have support size polynomial in n .

5 Applications

Räcke describes several applications to his results, with oblivious routing being a prominent example. Here we concentrate only on one of the applications, that of min-bisection that served as our motivating example.

Let G be a connected graph on an even number n of vertices, in which edges have nonnegative capacities. One wishes to find a bisection of minimum width (total capacity of edges with endpoints in different sides of the bipartization). We present here a polynomial time algorithm with approximation ratio $\tilde{O}(\log n)$.

Consider an arbitrary spanning tree T of G . Every edge $e = (i, j)$ of T partitions the vertices of G into two sets that we call T_i and T_j . Define the load

$load_T(e)$ of edge e to be the sum of capacities of edges of G with one endpoint in T_i and the other endpoint in T_j . (This is consistent with Section 3.1.)

Consider now an arbitrary bipartization B of G . Let $E_T(B)$ be the set of edges of T that have endpoints in different sides of the bipartization. Then the width of the bipartization is at most $\sum_{e \in E_T(B)} load_T(e)$. (The load terms count every edge of G cut by the bipartition at least once and perhaps multiple times, and possibly also count edges of G not in the bipartization.) This is the *domination* property that we were referring to in Section 2.

By Theorem 1, whose proof is summarized in Section 5, one can find in polynomial time a distribution over spanning trees of G such that for every edge of G , its expected congestion (over choice of random spanning tree) is at most $\delta = \tilde{O}(\log n)$.

Consider an optimal bisection in G , and let b denote its width. For each edge cut by the bisection, its expected congestion over the probabilistic mapping into spanning trees is at most δ . Summing over all edges cut by the bisection and taking a weighted average over all spanning trees in the probabilistic mapping, we obtain that at least in one such tree T , the width of this bipartization (with respect to the load in that tree) is at most δb .

The above discussion gives the following algorithm for finding a bisection of small width in a graph G whose minimum bisection has width b .

1. Find a probabilistic mapping into spanning trees with congestion at most δ . (By the discussion above this step takes polynomial time, and δ can be taken to be $\tilde{O}(\log n)$. Furthermore, the set of spanning trees in the support of the probabilistic mapping has size polynomial in n .)
2. In each spanning tree, find an optimal bisection (with respect to the load) using dynamic programming. This takes polynomial time. Moreover, by the discussion above, in at least one tree the bisection found will have width at most δb .
3. Of all the bisections found (one per spanning tree), take the one that in G has smallest width. By the domination property, its width is at most δb .

The approximation ratio that we presented above for min-bisection is $\delta = \tilde{O}(\log n)$, rather than $O(\log n)$ as was done by Räcke. To get the $O(\log n)$ approximation, instead of probabilistic mappings into spanning trees one simply uses probabilistic mappings into (arbitrary but dominating) trees. Then one can plug in the bounds of [9] rather than the somewhat weaker bounds of [1] and obtain the desired approximation ratio. Details omitted.

6 Spanning trees in planar graphs

In Section 3.4 we saw that for distributions over spanning trees of planar graphs, the distributions achieving low stretch are very different from those achieving low congestion. In this section we present an interesting connection between

low stretch and low congestion for spanning trees in planar graphs. A similar connection was observed independently (and apparently, before our work) by Yuval Emek [8].

The family of graphs that we shall consider is that of 2-connected planar multigraphs. Specifically, the graphs need to be planar, connected, with no cut edge (an edge whose removal disconnects the graph), and parallel edges are allowed. In the context of spanning trees, restricting graphs to be 2-connected is not a significant restriction, because disconnected graphs do not have spanning trees, and every cut edge belongs to every spanning tree and hence does not contribute to the complexity of the problem. The reason why we allow parallel edges is so that the notion of a dual of a planar graph will always be defined. From every set of parallel edges, a spanning tree may contain at most one edge.

Every planar graph can be embedded in the plane with no intersecting edges. In fact, several algorithms are known to produce such embeddings in linear time. This embedding might not be unique, in which case we fix one planar embedding arbitrarily. Given a planar embedding, the *dual* graph is obtained by considering every face of the embedding (including the outer face) to be a vertex of the dual graph, and every edge of the embedding corresponds to an edge of the dual graph that connects the two vertices that correspond to the two faces that the edge separates. (The fact that the graph has no cut edges insures that the dual has no self loops. Two faces that share more than one edge give in the dual parallel edges.) The dual graph is planar and the planar embedding that we associate with it is the one naturally obtained by the above construction. Under this planar embedding, the dual of the dual is the primal graph. Cycles in the primal graph correspond to cuts in the dual graph and vice versa. It is well known and easy to see that given a spanning tree in the primal graph, the edges not in the spanning tree form a spanning tree in the dual graph. (This also gives Euler's formula that $|V| - 1 + |F| - 1 = |E|$.)

Consider now a length function on the edges of the primal graph. Given a spanning tree of the primal graph, for every spanning tree edge its stretch is 1, and for every other edge its stretch is determined by the length of the fundamental cycle that it closes with the spanning tree edges. In the dual graph, let the capacity of an edge be equal to the length of the corresponding edge in the primal graph. Consider the dual spanning tree. The congestion of edges not on the dual spanning tree is 0 (one less than their stretch in the primal). The load of an edge on the dual spanning tree is precisely the sum of capacities of the corresponding fundamental cycle in the primal graph, and hence the congestion is exactly one more than the stretch in the primal.

The above deterministic correspondence has the following probabilistic corollary.

Corollary 7 *Consider an arbitrary 2-connected planar graph G and its planar dual $\bar{G}$. Assume that edges in G have nonnegative lengths whereas edges in $\bar{G}$ have nonnegative capacities, and moreover, the capacity of an edge in $\bar{G}$ is equal to the length of the corresponding edge in G . Then for every probabilistic mapping of G into spanning trees with stretch ρ , the same distribution over the*

dual trees forms probabilistic mapping of $\bar{G}$ into spanning trees with congestion at most $\rho+1$. Likewise, for every probabilistic mapping of $\bar{G}$ into spanning trees with congestion ρ , the same distribution over the dual trees forms a probabilistic mapping of G into spanning trees with stretch at most $\rho+1$.

Acknowledgements

We thank Satyen Kale for helpful discussions on the subjects of this manuscript.

References

- [1] Ittai Abraham, Yair Bartal, Ofer Neiman: Nearly Tight Low Stretch Spanning Trees. FOCS 2008: 781-790.
- [2] Noga Alon, Richard M. Karp, David Peleg, Douglas B. West: A Graph-Theoretic Game and Its Application to the k-Server Problem. SIAM J. Comput. 24(1): 78-100 (1995).
- [3] Sanjeev Arora, Elad Hazan, and Satyen Kale. Multiplicative weights method: a meta-algorithm and its applications. <http://www.cs.princeton.edu/~arora/pubs/MWsurvey.pdf>
- [4] Sanjeev Arora, Satish Rao, Umesh V. Vazirani: Expander flows, geometric embeddings and graph partitioning. J. ACM 56(2): (2009).
- [5] Yair Bartal: Probabilistic Approximations of Metric Spaces and Its Algorithmic Applications. FOCS 1996: 184-193.
- [6] Avrim Blum and Yishay Mansour. Learning, Regret Minimization, and Equilibria. Book chapter in Algorithmic Game Theory, Noam Nisan, Tim Roughgarden, Eva Tardos, and Vijay Vazirani, eds., Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [7] Michael Elkin, Yuval Emek, Daniel A. Spielman, Shang-Hua Teng: Lower-Stretch Spanning Trees. SIAM J. Comput. 38(2): 608-628 (2008).
- [8] Yuval Emek. k-Outerplanar Graphs, Planar Duality, and Low Stretch Spanning Trees. To appear in ESA 2009.
- [9] Jittat Fakcharoenphol, Satish Rao, Kunal Talwar: A tight bound on approximating arbitrary metrics by tree metrics. J. Comput. Syst. Sci. 69(3): 485-497 (2004).
- [10] <http://www.wisdom.weizmann.ac.il/~feige/Slides/CapacityMapping.ppt>
- [11] Uriel Feige, Robert Krauthgamer: A Polylogarithmic Approximation of the Minimum Bisection. SIAM J. Comput. 31(4): 1090-1118 (2002).
- [12] Yoav Freund and Robert E. Schapire. Adaptive game playing using multiplicative weights. Games and Economic Behavior, 29:79–103, 1999.

- [13] Martin Grotschel, Laszlo Lovasz, Alexander Schrijver: Geometric Algorithms and Combinatorial Optimization, Springer, 1988;
- [14] Frank Thomson Leighton, Satish Rao: Multicommodity max-flow min-cut theorems and their use in designing approximation algorithms. J. ACM 46(6): 787-832 (1999).
- [15] Nathan Linial, Eran London, Yuri Rabinovich: The Geometry of Graphs and Some of its Algorithmic Applications. Combinatorica 15(2): 215-245 (1995).
- [16] Harald Räcke: Optimal hierarchical decompositions for congestion minimization in networks. STOC 2008: 255-264.